

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 9 is canceled by the instant response, and claim 16 is added. No claims are amended or canceled. Accordingly, following entry of the instant response, claims 1-8 and 10-16 will remain pending for examination.

As a threshold matter, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Allowed claims 1-8 and 10-15 are unchanged by this response, and remain in condition for allowance.

In the latest office action, the Examiner objected to the title of the application, and requested that the application be amended to recite a new title. This has now been done, with the wording of the amended title providing additional detail.

Also in the latest office action, the Examiner objected to and rejected claim 9 on a number of different grounds. These claim objections and rejections are overcome as follows.

First, the Examiner had objected to the numbering of claim 9, as this independent claim lay between claims 1-8, and claims 10-15 depending therefrom. To address this issue, claim 9 has now been canceled and added as new claim 16.

Second, the Examiner had rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C §112 ¶2 for failure to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "insulative film". Accordingly, new independent claim 16 recites an "insulative layer" rather than an "insulative film".

Finally, the Examiner also rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C §112 ¶1 for lack of enablement, and objected to the drawings are also objected to for failing to illustrate the subject matter of claim 9. The enablement rejection is overcome as follows.

The MPEP emphasizes that the question regarding enablement is whether the experimentation needed to practice the invention is undue or unreasonable. (Emphasis added; MPEP §2164.01, citing In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 9 is both enabled and adequately described by the instant application. Specifically, the embodiment of claim 9 is described in the specification in connection with the ninth embodiment at ¶[0107-0109] and in Figure 16.

Applicants further note that the last clause of claim 16 recites, "wherein the electrode underlying film is formed directly on the insulative layer". Embodiments of the present invention disclose an electrode underlying film which is formed on the substrate and below the antiferromagnetic layer, thereby eliminating the need for a magnetic domain control film. Advantageously, therefore, the device output can be stabilized without the magnetic domain control film where the width of the free layer as viewed from an air bearing surface is defined as T_{wr_geo} (nm) and expressed as x , and " $x < 40$ ", as recited in claim 16. Moreover, support for this recited dimension is explicitly provided in the instant specification at ¶[0111].

Applicants' ample description and illustration of this claimed feature is certainly sufficiently detailed to teach one of ordinary skill in the art to create a magnetoresistive head having the properties recited, without unreasonable or undue experimentation. Continued maintenance of the nonenablement claim rejection and the objection to the drawings is accordingly improper, and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-324-6303 (direct).

Respectfully submitted,



Kent J. Tobin
Reg. No. 39,496

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
KJT;srb

60902342 v1